App. No. 10/055,757 Reply to Office Action dated June 30, 2003 Page 8

Remarks

In this response, claims 1, 14, 19, and 22 have been amended. No claims have been added or canceled. Accordingly, claims 1-22 remain pending in the present application. Reconsideration of the above-identified patent application is hereby requested.

Under 35 U.S.C. § 1.116(a), and M.P.E.P. 714.12, Applicants hereby request entry of the preceding amendments to claims 1, 14, 19, and 22, which Applicants believe place the case in condition for allowance. The amendments made to the claims do not raise any new issues, but were made only to clarify what is claimed in the present invention. They do not add any further limitations and thus will not require a further search or consideration. In the event the Examiner does not concur, these amendments are proper as placing the claims in better form for appeal before the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences. Reconsideration of the Application in view of these amendments and the following discussion is hereby requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-10 and 14-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 1,272,115, issued to Russell (herein <u>Russell</u>). In addition, the Examiner has rejected claims 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,757,269 issued to Roth (herein <u>Roth</u>). Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is requested in view of the amendments and addition made to the claims and of the following discussion.

It is axiomatic that for a reference to be anticipatory, each and every feature in the claims must be disclosed by the single reference. Neither <u>Russell</u> or <u>Roth</u> anticipates the features present in the currently amended claims to provide "a door guide having a structure for retaining a door while allowing the door to slidably travel in the door guide to engage the striker plate.

<u>Russell</u> discloses that a plate (5) and a top plate (6) may be adjusted horizontally and vertically in a door jamb. However, <u>Russell</u> does not teach the provision of a door guide, on which the

App. No. 10/055,757 Reply to Office Action dated June 30, 2003 Page 9

adjustable door guide latch slot assembly is mounted, that includes a structure to hold the door and allow the door to slidably move therein (for example, up and down). Applicant respectfully notes that, contrary to the assertion by the Examiner, no such disclosure was found in <u>Russell</u>. Further, <u>Roth</u> also does not disclose such a feature.

In view of the foregoing discussion and the amendments made to the claims, Applicant submits that the § 102(b) rejections are overcome. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 102(b) rejections be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 11-13 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Russell</u>, in view of <u>Roth</u>. In addition, the Examiner has rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Roth</u> and claim 22 as being unpatentable over Russell.

As discussed above, neither <u>Russell</u> or <u>Roth</u> teaches a door guide as claimed by Applicant in the independent claims 1, 14, 19 and 22. Applicant further submits that neither <u>Roth</u> or <u>Russell</u> suggest the claimed "door guide." Thus, as claims 11-13, 18 and 21 are dependent on allowable independent claims, Applicant submits that these claims are allowable over the prior art as well.

In view of the foregoing discussion, Applicant submits that the § 103 rejections are overcome. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 103 rejections be withdrawn.

///

///

///

App. No. 10/055,757 Reply to Office Action dated June 30, 2003 Page 10

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will expedite the prosecution of this application, he is invited to contact the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Pate Date

GEORGE G. C. TSENC

Reg. No. 41,355

GCT/ke1

JEFFER, MANGELS, BUTLER & MARMARO LLP Seventh Floor 1900 Avenue of the Stars Los Angeles, CA 90067 Tel: (310) 203-8080

CUSTOMER NO. 24574